

A conveyance, though fraudulent as to creditors, is yet good against the grantor and volunteers claiming under him.

Though a husband cannot *by will* deprive his wife of her share of his personal estate, yet he has the power to dispose absolutely of such property during his life by sale or gift, and if he reserves no right to himself, the transfer will prevail against the wife, though made to defeat her claim.

But if the conveyance or transfer be a mere device or contrivance by which the husband, not parting with the absolute dominion over the property during his life, seeks at his death to deprive his widow of her share of his personalty, it will be ineffectual against her.

Where a paper is never produced, nor its absence accounted for, its contents cannot be proved by parol.

A conveyance of personal property by a husband which would be good against the claim of the wife in case she survived him, is also good against her claim for a living during their separation.

According to the practice in this State, an objection for the want of jurisdiction may be taken at the hearing, though not presented either by plea, answer, or demurrer.

The Act of 1841, ch. 163, is confined in its operation to the Appellate Court, and the Court of Chancery may, *sua sponte*, refuse relief if it appear from the proceedings that it has no jurisdiction, though the defendant does not make the objection by the pleadings.

The fact that the complainant had previously filed her bill in the equity side of the County Court for a divorce and alimony, is an insuperable objection to the Court of Chancery granting her relief upon her bill there for alimony.

When two Courts have concurrent jurisdiction over the same subject-matter, the Court in which the suit is first commenced is entitled to retain it: the other has no authority to interfere, and will as soon as judicially informed of the pendency of the prior suit dismiss the subsequent proceedings.

[The facts of this case are sufficiently stated in the following opinion of the Chancellor.]

THE CHANCELLOR:

This case, which has been fully and ably argued by the counsel on both sides, comes before the Court upon a motion to dissolve the injunctions granted upon the filing of the bill, which motion is met on the other side with an application for the appointment of a receiver, as prayed for in the bill, but held over for the coming in of the answer.

The bill, though it probably makes a case which, if sustained